

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 9-11, 13-17, 21-22, 24-27 are currently pending in the present application. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed. No new matter has been added.

### **SUMMARY OF TELECONFERENCE WITH EXAMINER KARL FRECH**

Applicant's attorney, Edwin W. Bacon, Jr. (USPTO Reg. No. 39,098) held a teleconference with the Examiner on March 3, 2008. The discussion focused on whether Goto et al. (2003/0225668) discloses structure which acquires information relating to a predicted travel route. The Examiner provisionally conceded that it does not and that the claims therefore appear to be in a condition for allowance. The Examiner reserved the right to reconsider the concession and grounds for rejection upon receipt and consideration of this paper.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-11, 13-17, 21, 22, 24-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Goto et al. (2003/0225668). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Goto is directed to the system of acquiring traffic data. Goto discloses a system of negotiating for the exchange of telematic data (data created by the combination of telecommunications and information processing capabilities of an automobile) between traveling vehicles and system nodes for determining present traffic patterns and predicting

future traffic patterns. Goto does not appear to predict a travel destination of a particular vehicle.

In contrast, the claimed inventions relate to the information acquisition method including a step of predicting travel destination or travel route based on the travel history. Accordingly, Applicants believe there is no linkage between the claimed inventions and Goto. About predicting travel destination, Goto merely recites "The destination may be directly input by the user or determined by the telematic base 10 by historical data and time of day" ([0038]), which fails to suggest the specific features of the claimed inventions.


Furthermore, "node" in Goto means system node and is entirely different from "node" of the present application, which indicates a geographic node such as an intersection and a landmark.

## CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 26, 2008

By:   
Edwin W. Bacon, Jr.  
Reg. No. 39,098

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

EWB/sjr